



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

This M. Crahay entirely approves of, as, indeed, he must do, if he is to be a good Catholic. Of course, books of this sort are in no sense scientific, except in so far as they simply report facts, for the reason that they accept certain foregone conclusions due, not to science, but to what professes to be a revelation. Science, on the contrary, can take no account of revelation except as a complex of phenomena to be studied and explained according to its own laws.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

THE THEORY OF THE DIVINE RIGHT OF KINGS. By J. N. Figgis, Lecturer on History in St. Catherine's College, Cambridge: Prince Consort Dissertation for 1892. Cambridge: University Press, 1896.

The first object of Mr. Figgis's book—which has been rewritten and greatly enlarged since it was composed as a Prize Essay—is to give an account of the controversy waged round the theory of Divine Right under the Stuart dynasty, and to show its bearing on questions that still affect us at the present day. And this task Mr. Figgis has discharged with notable efficiency, though, with the zeal of an explorer, he is perhaps tempted to see more in what he brings back with him than others will be disposed to find.

The value of the book is still further increased by two preliminary discussions,—the first concerned with the controversy between Papalists and Imperialists during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; the second with the political theories which sprang up during the struggle between the league and the kings of France and Navarre during the closing years of the sixteenth century.

Mr. Figgis aims at showing that the champions of Divine Right inherited the arguments and the essential ideas of the mediæval Imperialists. And, so far, he may be held to have fairly proved his point. But when he maintains that their plea was directed no less against the Papists than the Protestant Dissenters and the claims of Parliament, his argument becomes more questionable. And when, in support of this view, he is led to assert that during the first half of the seventeenth century England was in no small danger of a Popish reaction (p. 89), he is surely going farther than the facts of the case can be said to warrant.

Such exaggerations, however, may readily be pardoned in view of the fresh significance which Mr. Figgis gives to an extinct controversy and the insight he shows in bringing a much abused theory into relation with the whole course of political speculation in West-

ern Europe during the centuries immediately before and after the Reformation. A further merit of the book, and one closely connected with the above, is the clear perception it shows that under the grotesque arguments of Divine Right was concealed a conception of sovereignty, of the need of recognizing some absolutely controlling power in the state, to which Locke and the other champions of individual rights were habitually blind. Whether Mr. Figgis might not have gone yet further and recognized, more than he seems disposed to do, that there was a truth contained in the assertion that government depends on "divine ordinance," is another question, and one on which his readers will inevitably differ. None, however, can fail to acknowledge the exceptional industry with which he has mastered his materials and the conspicuous ability with which he interprets them. All will unite in hoping that "at some future date it may be in his power to attempt a fuller account of the developments which political theory has undergone since the later Middle Ages." (Preface.)

C. VAUGHAN.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, CARDIFF.

ANTIMACHUS OF COLOPHON AND THE POSITION OF WOMEN IN GREEK POETRY. By E. F. M. Benecke. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1896.

We have here a collection of unfinished essays by E. F. M. Benecke, the young scholar whose death occurred in Switzerland last year. Mr. Benecke's endeavor has been to show that "romantic"—that is, pure and impassioned—love between man and woman was practically unknown in Greece throughout classical times until the Alexandrian period. According to Mr. Benecke, it was the now obscure Antimachus of Colophon who introduced the reformation in lyric poetry, and he was followed in comedy by Menander. Mr. Benecke's work shows wide reading, considerable ingenuity and promise; but it cannot be said that he has done anything to establish his case; and it is likely that his maturer judgment would have repudiated many of the conclusions found in this volume, would not have described Euripides, the poet *par excellence* of woman's devotion and self-sacrifice, as an author with only the faintest glimmerings of what love really meant, nor found in the weak sentimentalities of the Alexandrian writers the dawn of a nobler ideal.

F. MELIAN STAWELL.

LONDON.